UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/840,157	05/06/2004	Oliver Birch	CHA920030037US1	7410
McGinn & Gibl	7590 09/26/200 b, PLLC	EXAMINER		
Suite 304		GAY, SONIA L		
2568-A Riva Road Annapolis, MD 21401			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•	•			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/26/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/840,157	BIRCH, OLIVER		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	SONIA GAY	2614		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 Ju This action is FINAL . 2b)☑ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 15,17,21,22,24 and 28 is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 15,17,21,22,24 and 28 is/are rejected 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the confidence of th	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). lected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 05/06/2008.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte		

Application/Control Number: 10/840,157 Page 2

Art Unit: 2614

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is written in response to Amendment submitted on 06/16/2008 in which claims 15, 17, 21-22, 24, and 28 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 2. Claims 15 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 15 and 22 recite "wherein said parlay gateway provides unique functionality that is independent of the call processing functionality of remaining elements of said telephone."

However, the preceding limitations of both claims 15 and 22 recite a "telephone network".

Examiner interpreted the limitation to recite "remaining elements of said telephone network".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. Claims 15, 17, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bhatia et al. (US 2008/0076395) in view of Weaver et al. (US 7,149,504), and further in view of McQuillan et al. (US 7,207,048).
- 4. For claim 15, Bhatia et al. discloses a method for providing call control in a telephone network, said method comprising:

directing a telephone call to a service node call ([0031]);

Art Unit: 2614

forwarding an application request from said service node to a parlay gateway ([0031]); forwarding a request for instruction from said parlay gateway to a telephony application server ([0031]);

returning a routing requirement from said telephony application server to said parlay gateway, (IVR connection request, connection request between caller and called devices: [0031])

forwarding said routing application from said parlay gateway to said service node ([0031]);

executing said routing application (request : [0031]) using said service node ([0031]); routing said telephone call based on the results of said routing application ([0031]). wherein said routing of said telephone call is performed using a service switching point connected to said service node, and wherein said service switching point and said parlay gateway bypass signaling transfer points ([0031])

Yet, Bhatia et al. fails to teach

dynamically transforming said routing requirement into a routing application using said parlay gateway;

wherein said parlay gateway comprises a HTTP server and provides unique functionality that is independent of the call processing functionality of remaining elements of said telephone network.

However, Weaver et al. discloses a parlay gateway that is adapted to dynamically transform information (*location information*: column 9 line 30) into an application (*protocol understood by application within the mobile station*: column 9 lines 30-33) for the purpose of forwarding the information to an application within the mobile station. (column 9 lines 30-33).

Moreover, McQuillan et al. discloses a parlay gateway comprising a HTTP server (*Abstract*: column 4 lines 15 - 23) for the purpose of providing a unique functionality that is independent of the call processing functionality of the remaining elements of said telephone $\underline{\text{network}}$ (column 9 lines 9 – 17, 47 – 48; column 10 lines 20 - 27, 60 – 65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Bhatia et al. with the teachings of Weaver et al. and McQuillan et al. so the parlay gateway disclosed above in Bhatia et al. comprises a HTTP server, provides unique functionality that is independent of the call processing functionality of remaining elements of said telephone network, and transforms the routing requirement into a routing application for the purpose of forwarding the routing information to the service node.

For claims 17 and 21, the teachings of Bhatia et al., Weaver et al., and McQuillan et al. further disclose wherein said

parlay gateway functions in heterogeneous environments and works with different types of service nodes. (McQuillan et al., Figure 1 and column 1 lines 33 - 38).

service node is adapted to report call status to said parlay gateway (Bhatia et al, *call going off hook-call event*: [0031]).

5. Claims 22, 24, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bhatia et al. (US 2008/0076395) in view of McQuillan et al. (US 7,207,048), and further in view of Dunko et al. (US 2002/0072347), and further in view of Weaver et al. (US 7,149,504).

6. For claim 22, Bhatia et al. discloses a method for providing call control in a telephone network, said method comprising:

directing a telephone call to a service node call ([0031]);

forwarding an application request from said service node to a parlay gateway ([0031]); forwarding a request for instruction from said parlay gateway to a telephony application

server ([0031]);

returning a routing requirement from said telephony application server to said parlay gateway, (IVR connection request, connection request between caller and called devices: [0031]);

forwarding said routing application from said parlay gateway to said service node ([0031]);

executing said routing application (*request* : [0031]) using said service node ([0031]); routing said telephone call based on the results of said routing application ([0031]).

wherein said routing of said telephone call is performed using a service switching point connected to said service node, and wherein said service switching point and said parlay gateway bypass signaling transfer points ([0031])

Yet, Bhatia et al. fails to teach the following:

a server and parlay gateway combination wherein the server portion comprises a HTTP server and the server and parlay gateway combination provides unique functionality that is independent of the call processing functionality of the remaining elements of said telephone network;

forwarding a hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) call control extensible markup language (CCXML) application request to said server and parlay gateway combination; and,

dynamically transforming said routing requirement into a CCXML routing application using said server and parlay gateway combination and executing said CCXML routing application to route said telephone call.

However, McQuillan et al. discloses a gateway comprising a HTTP server, XML interpreter, and parlay interface (*Abstract*: column 4 lines 15 - 23; column 9 lines 29 - 30; column 10 lines 44 - 45) for the purpose of providing a unique functionality that is independent of the call processing functionality of the remaining elements of said telephone {network} (column 9 lines 9 - 17, 47 - 48; column 10 lines 20 - 27, 60 - 65).

Additionally, Dunko et al. discloses a service node (MSC: [0023]) that is adapted to forward a hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) call control extensible markup language (CCXML) (communication between MSC and help server through a gateway may take a number of forms, but in an exemplary embodiment comprises a HTTP style communication: [0023]) for the purpose of communicating with a gateway and a remote server ([0023]).

Moreover, Weaver et al. discloses a parlay gateway that is adapted to dynamically transform information (*location information*: column 9 line 30) into an application (*protocol*

understood by application within the mobile station: column 9 lines 30-33) for the purpose of forwarding the information to the application within the mobile station. (column 9 lines 30-33).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Bhatia et al. with the teachings of McQullan et al., Dunko et al, and Weaver et al. as follows:

include a http server with the parlay gateway disclosed above in Bhatia et al. for the purpose of receiving a hypertext protocol call control extensible markup language (CCXML) application request for the service node;

allow the server and gateway combination to transform the routing requirement into a CCXML routing application for the purpose forwarding the routing application to the service node; and,

adapt the service node disclosed above in Bhatia et al. to execute the HTTP style communication routing application, CCXML, for the purpose of routing said telephone call.

For claims 24 and 28, the teachings of Bhatia et al., McQuillan et al., Dunko et al., and Weaver et al., further disclose wherein said

parlay gateway functions in heterogeneous environments and works with different types of service nodes. (McQuillan et al., Figure 1 and column 1 lines 33 - 38).

service node is adapted to report call status to said parlay gateway (Bhatia et al, *call going off hook-call event*: [0031]).

Application/Control Number: 10/840,157 Page 8

Art Unit: 2614

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 15, 17, 21 - 22, 24, and 28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sonia Gay whose telephone number is (571) 270-1951. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 7:30 AM to 5:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad F. Matar can be reached on (571) 272-7488. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sonia Gay/ Examiner, Art Unit 2614

/Ahmad F. Matar/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2614 Application/Control Number: 10/840,157

Page 9

Art Unit: 2614